

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 5-27 stand rejected under 35 USC §112 as being indefinite for failure for particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, it is the Examiner's position that Claim 1 fails to recite sufficient structural elements and any connection thereof to positively position and define how the work support structure, presentation structure and ornamental side of the presentation area obscures the view of the presentation area so that an integral structure is able to function as claimed as recited. It is believed that with the cancellation of Claim 1 and the introduction of new Claim 28, the rejection of 35 USC §112 is rendered moot.

Turning to the art rejections, Claims 1-3 and 5-27 stand rejected as being unpatentable over *Steinhilber*. The rejection is respectfully traversed. In *Steinhilber* the work support structure 20 is not moveable relative to the presentation support structure whereby the work side (top) is moveable from a position where the work side is generally transverse to a presentation area to a position where the work side obscures the presentation area and presents an ornamental side from the perspective of a user. Stated differently, in *Steinhilber* the presentation area is at all times visible to the perspective of a user and no provision is made for moving the work support structure 20 to a position where that view is obscured. Nor would it be obvious to modify the structure of *Steinhilber* in accordance with applicant's furniture system as set forth in Claim 28. Specifically, there is no motivation to the skilled artisan from reviewing the *Steinhilber* reference to modify the structure of *Steinhilber* such that the work support structure (20) would obscure the presentation area, to the extent *Steinhilber* even discloses the presentation area. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-3

and 5-27 are patentable over *Steinhilber*. Claim 4 stands rejected as being obvious over *Steinhilber* in view of *Leonard*. This rejection is also respectfully traversed. Claim 4 is dependent upon Claim 28 that, as demonstrated above, is clearly patentable over *Steinhilber*. The infirmities of the *Steinhilber* reference *vis-a-vis* Claim 28 are not cured by resort to a combination with the *Leonard* reference. Accordingly, since Claim 4 further limits Claim 28, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 4 is likewise patentable over *Steinhilber* in view of *Leonard*.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims are in condition for allowance, which is hereby earnestly solicited and respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



C. James Bushman
Reg. No. 24,810

Date: May 10, 2006

BROWNING BUSHMAN P.C.
5718 Westheimer, Suite 1800
Houston, TX 77057-5771
Tel.: (713) 266-5593
Fax: (713) 266-5169

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I, Sheri Cooper, hereby certify that this correspondence and all referenced enclosures are being deposited by me with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on May 10, 2006.

By: 